

**REMARKS**

In response to the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment dated April 30, 2008, the Examiner indicated that all sections of the response should start on a new page. Therefore, the Applicants request that the Examiner reconsider the response filed March 28, 2008 in light of the corrections.

In an Official Action dated April 26, 2007, the Examiner rejected claims 1-14 and 26-29 as indefinite under §112 and/or as obvious in light of Sousloff 4,600,334. Applicants request that the Examiner reconsider the rejection in light of the following discussion.

Although claim 1 was clear and definite, claim 1 has been amended in a way that should eliminate the Examiner's objection. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejection of claims 1-8 and 26-29 under §112.

With regard to Soussloff, the Examiner has recognized that Soussloff does not teach a device having an outer sleeve that is configured to impede expansion when the device is tightened to clamp down the inner sleeve down. However, the Examiner states that the rigidity of the outer sleeve is an obvious variation, citing In re Karlson for support.

However, the Examiner's analysis is legally flawed. The Official Action

states that In re Karlson supports the position that “omission of an element and its function **in combination where the remaining elements perform the same function as before** involves only routine skill in the art.” (emphasis added). The flaw in the analysis is that combination of the remaining elements in Applicant’s claim perform a vastly different function than the Sousloff ‘334 device.

Soussloff ‘334 is directed to a device for clamping a cylindrical shaft onto the cylindrical bore of a machine element, without the need to use a keyed shaft and a keyhole in the machine element. To do so, Soussloff ‘334 uses multiple expanding sleeves. When the device is tightened, the inner sleeve clamps down on the shaft and the outer sleeve expands outwardly to clamp into the bore of the machine element. If the outer sleeve is rigid so that it cannot expand, then the Soussloff device cannot mount the machine element to the shaft. In other words, the Soussloff device cannot perform the same function as before.

Further still, claim 1 recites that the outer sleeve has a frustoconical engagement surface

There simply is absolutely no teaching or suggestion in Soussloff ‘334 to use a rigid outer sleeve that does not expand. Using a rigid outer sleeve would completely defeat the purpose of the Sousloff device. Therefore, Sousloff teaches away from using a rigid outer sleeve as is incorporated into Applicant’s device.

The only way to read Sousloff '344 onto Applicant's claimed device is to use hindsight with Applicant's own disclosure as a road map, because there is no teaching or suggestion or any showing of motivation to go from the device of Sousloff '334 to Applicant's device. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejection of claims 1-14 and 26-29.

In light of the foregoing, Applicant believes that this application is in form for allowance. The Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney if the Examiner believes that issues remain regarding the allowability of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

DANN, DORFMAN, HERRELL & SKILLMAN  
A Professional Corporation  
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By //Stephen Eland//  
Stephen H. Eland  
PTO Registration No. 41,010

Telephone: (215) 563-4100  
Facsimile: (215) 563-4044